



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,776	09/29/2003	Nayel Saleh	6065-88618	2480
24628	7590	04/04/2006	EXAMINER	
WELSH & KATZ, LTD 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606			ELAHEE, MD S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2614	

DATE MAILED: 04/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/673,776	SALEH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Md S. Elahee	2614	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is responsive to an amendment filed on 01/17/06. Claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. The arguments filed in the 01/17/06 Remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following:

The arguments appear to suggest converting voice contact information to contact data in digitized, packetized form using speech recognition. However, the claim only recites 'converting voice contact information to contact data in digitized, packetized form'. Ramey teaches this limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-6 and 9-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128).

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Ramey teaches a method of contact manipulation and retrieval in an automatic call distribution system (col.1, lines 58-60), comprising the steps of:

receiving a message having voice contact information (col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-56).

Art Unit: 2614

converting the voice contact information to contact data in digitized, packetized form (col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-64).

storing the contact data (col.4, lines 62-64, col.5, lines 15-22).

searching the stored contact data (fig.3; col.5, lines 53-64).

wherein the contact data is searched for at least one item of information (col.5, lines 53-64).

Regarding claims 2, 10 and 14, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is inherently packetized to thereby convert contact information in the voice message to contact data (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 3, 11 and 15, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is converted to digitized [i.e., text] as the contact data (col.4, lines 59-64).

Regarding claims 4, 12 and 16, Ramey teaches that the message is a voice message, and wherein the voice message is packetized, and wherein the packetized voice message is converted to text as the contact data (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Regarding claims 5 and 17, Ramey teaches that the system has at least one agent, and wherein the method further comprises providing at least one plug-in that implements conversion and storing of contact data in the automatic call distribution system (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.1, lines 58-60, col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). (Note; agents are software routines and algorithms)

Ramey further teaches assigning inherently the at least one plug-in to the agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Art Unit: 2614

Ramey further teaches activating the at least one plug-in for the agent when a message having contact information is received at the automatic call distribution system (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Regarding claims 6 and 18, Ramey teaches that the automatic call distribution system has a plurality of agents and a plurality of plug-ins, and wherein the method further comprises determining inherently for a respective agent of the plurality of agents the at least one plug-in, which is assigned to the respective agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.5, lines 15-22, 53-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). (Note; agents are software routines and algorithms)

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 6. Furthermore, Ramey teaches a plurality of format conversion plug-ins (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 7 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128) in view of Holmes, JR. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0138296).

Regarding claims 7 and 19, Ramey further teaches activating the plug-in for the agent (abstract; fig.2, 4; col.4, lines 59-64, col.7, line 64- col.8, line 15). However, Ramey does not specifically teach “the agent logs onto the automatic call distribution system”. Holmes teaches that the agent logs onto the automatic call distribution system (page 6, paragraph 0075). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramey to allow the agent logging onto the automatic call distribution system as taught by Holmes. The motivation for the modification is to provide status of agent.

8. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128) in view of Goldberg et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,223,156).

Regarding claim 8, Ramey does not specifically teach “messages are converted to text by a voice recognition unit, stored in a central repository for use in post-processing and search for key word matches”. Goldberg teaches that messages are converted to text by a voice recognition unit, stored in a central repository for use in post-processing and search for key word matches (fig.1,2; col.2, lines 43-52). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramey to incorporate messages being converted to text by a voice recognition unit, stored in a central repository for use in post-processing and search for key word matches as taught by Goldberg. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to retrieve correct contact information for later use.

9. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,128) in view of Johnson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,349).

Regarding claim 20, Ramey does not specifically teach “the communication system is an automatic call distribution system”. Johnson teaches that the communication system is an automatic call distribution system (abstract; fig.1-3). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Ramey to incorporate the communication system being an automatic call distribution system as taught by Johnson. The motivation for the modification is to have doing so in order to connect a caller to one of a plurality of agents in order to meet caller’s need.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kermani (U.S. 6,567,506) teach Telephone number recognition of spoken telephone number in a voice message stored in a voice messaging system.

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2614

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.

MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE

March 31, 2006


FAN TSANG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600